

Gary Sorge, FASLA, CSLA, AICP
Senior Principal
Stantec
55 Church Street
New Haven, CT 06510

February 16, 2015

Dear Senator Carlo Leone, Co-Chairman, Representative David Baram, Co-Chairman
And Members of the General Law Committee

Re: SB-158, An Act Concerning Landscape Architect Licenses

I would like to express my opposition to SB-158, An Act Concerning Landscape Architect Licenses. As you know, like architects and engineers, landscape architects are entrusted through licensure to protect the public health, safety, and welfare. The proposed bill as presently written would greatly weaken the licensure standard for landscape architects in Connecticut by:

- 1) Potentially eliminating the requirement for the nationally accepted LARE exam, a four-part rigorous exam which 50 states require to gain licensure.
- 2) Reducing the technical training required. Currently, licensure applicants must acquire a degree from a college program accredited by the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB), such as UConn's landscape architecture program. The proposed bill says this training is unimportant and can be replaced with any "bachelor's degree" and three years training.

The current law makes an exception for the person who does not acquire LAAB-accredited education by requiring eight years of experience under the direction of a licensed landscape architect before they can sit for the exam. I believe the state's current licensing law sets an appropriate standard in this area and should not be weakened.

Education, experience, and examination are the core principles of licensure and demonstrate to the state that a person is minimally competent to uphold the public's interest in the practice of landscape architecture, a complex mix of site planning and design services which involve land grading, erosion control, plantings, hardscapes, lighting, stormwater management, traffic and pedestrian flow, protection of natural resources such as wetlands, soils, and wildlife, shoreline resiliency, and community sustainability. Our work involves major public spaces, health care and educational campuses, transportation facilities, mixed-use development, and natural resource protection and enhancement – a responsibility that requires specialized training and licensure to ensure that we continue to enhance the quality of life and health and well-being of Connecticut residents.

Our present strong licensure standard is well respected by peer professionals and government officials. If this proposed change is enacted it will risk my ability to

practice in Connecticut and in other jurisdictions, since a weakened license standard here will likely make me ineligible for reciprocity in other states.

For these reasons, I urge you to also oppose SB-158.

Sincerely,

Gary Sorge, FASLA, CSLA, AICP
Senior Principal
Stantec